



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

LANE MEDICAL LIBRARY STAMFORD STON  
X578 .C78 1905  
In defense of homoeopathy : Homoeopathy



24503372435

*In defense of homoeopathy.*  
*Copeland, R. S.*

X578

C78

1905

**LANE**

**MEDICAL**



**LIBRARY**

AMERICAN BANK NOTE CO. (1905)

In Defense of Homœopathy.  
Homœopathy: A Dialogue.  
Homœopathy: What It Is.



The Prize Essays in the Medical Century Competition.

Evangelistic Series.

Copyright 1905 by The Medical Century Co.

LANE LIBRARY



"They who have not tried Homœopathy have not half tried to get well."

---

"We do not prescribe for the name of the disease, but for the sick individual."

---

"Homœopathy stands confident and strong with a firm faith in its resources and its ability to cure the ills of the flesh in a manner easy, gentle and permanent."

518  
-78  
1905.

## IN DEFENSE OF HOMŒOPATHY.

BY ROYAL S. COPELAND, A. M., M. D., ANN ARBOR,  
MICH.

Every man for himself or his family must, on occasions, take a personal interest in the "pathy" problem. Most of the time he may feel as did the invalid who was asked whether he preferred a "Homœopath" or an "allopath," and whose answer was: "It makes no difference, both paths lead to the grave!" But when illness stalks into the household and possesses one of its inmates, it is no longer a question of physician or no physician; the kind of a doctor and which particular doctor then become burning problems demanding instant solution.

One of old said: "In time of peace prepare for war." The foresight and circumspection which prompted this maxim would probably lead its author to advocate the idea that in time of health preparation should be made for a possible illness, trifling or serious. It is the purpose of this essay to show why the physician determined upon as the one to call, when illness comes, should belong to the homœopathic school.

### Health and Disease.

To the lay mind, health and disease are terms which define conditions, one desirable and the other to be avoided. Beyond this vague mental description no further thought is given the problems which vex and perplex the scientists and divide the medical profession into great factions or "schools." With the conflicting and vacillating opinions of the past, it was necessary to be something of a mental gymnast to keep abreast of the rapidly changing ideas of scientific thinkers. Fortunately, however, this chaotic condition is giving way to an orderly arrangement of established facts, and to-day we know for a certainty many very interesting things about health and disease.

It is now believed that life depends upon the activity of bodily cells. Going from the gross mass

of the body to the separate and distinct tissues and from these to their minutest portions, it has been determined that the smallest possible division of living matter, capable of form and function, is the cell. The infinitesimal size of the cell is something amazing; in the liver, for instance, it has been found, by careful measurements and estimates, that a single cubic inch of that organ consists of 156,000 million separate and distinct cells.

Health depends upon the well-being of every cell of the body. The cells must be nourished and refreshed, waste products must be carried away, and new material supplied as required. In the light of present knowledge, disease consists of some disturbance in the metabolism of the cell. By this term, metabolism, we mean the balance or equilibrium which exists between food supply and waste; normally, this condition is reached when the active cell constantly receives and assimilates precisely the right amount of exactly the proper food. In disease this balance is disturbed, insufficient or improper food interferes with the cell, causing it to be over-active or under-active or to die. Then the individual becomes conscious of certain symptoms which are indicative of disease, and the physician's duty begins.

#### **The Size of the Dose.**

With this much scientific knowledge, briefly stated though it is, the lay mind will at once appreciate that medicine, to be of use to one of these bodily cells, must be administered in such form and quantity as such an infinitesimal thing is capable of receiving. One might as well attempt to patch a pin prick with one of the pyramids as to expect a teaspoonful of medicine to be appropriated by a cell. Only a very, very minute portion of such a dose, relatively so enormous, can be appropriated by the diseased cell, the untouched portions of the dose are in the system menacing myriads of other cells, which may and probably will be poisoned by the unwelcome drug. Perchance the cell or cells originally diseased may be restored to health, but the patient has gone from Scylla to Charybdis by having thrust upon him an illness quite as bad or worse, the direct result of drug action.

The quantity of medicine to be given in each dose has nothing to do with Homœopathy; it is the privilege of the prescriber to administer a grain, an ounce, or any amount which appeals to him as required by the patient. The homœopathic physician believes, however, that the "minimum dose" should be administered, that is, that the smallest possible quantity capable of relieving the need of the patient should be given. This is the ideal prescription, because it exactly supplies the demand of the diseased cells without disturbing other normal cells. In practice, therefore, the Homœopathist usually dispenses small doses.

#### **The Power of Drugs.**

The popular notion that the strength or power of a chemical is in direct proportion to its mass, is no longer the view of scientific men. It is now held that a very small amount of a drug or chemical, when perfectly dissolved in water or some other liquid, is much more potent than a thousand times as much of the same chemical in the dry state or imperfectly dissolved. This is the teaching in every laboratory of the world. Practical application of this fact is found in the modern use of blue vitriol in purifying water.\* A quantity so small as to have no effect upon the cells of the human body is yet capable of causing the death of certain algæ which possess a selective affinity for this particular chemical.

In the human body the cells of particular parts possess this same selective affinity for certain drugs or chemicals. When an infinitesimal amount of silver, for instance, is taken into the system, it may be found in certain tissues of the brain and always there, when it cannot be discovered elsewhere. Thus it is apparent that when any cell of the body lacks a given element necessary to its well being, its power of selection of the missing element, or "tissue proclivity," as it is termed, enables it to appropriate the same from the blood stream if it be there in ever so minute quantities.

---

\*An entertaining article on this subject was printed in the Century Magazine for November, 1904.



It will be seen, therefore, that the efficiency of the small dose and the capability of the human system to appropriate and utilize medicine administered in minute quantities are facts based, not upon a vagary of the imagination, but upon the most modern of accepted truths.

#### **The Selection of the Remedy.**

Not only does the homœopathic physician prescribe the "minimum dose," but also, in selecting the remedy for given symptoms of disease, he employs a fixed formula, expressed by the Latin phrase, *Similia similibus curantur*, translated "Similar are cured by similars," i. e., Like ailments are cured by like remedies. The possible existence of a law of cure is denied by the dominant school.\* The latter scoffs at the "theory of similars," and in prescribing, depends largely upon experimental and empirical methods. That is, the physician of the dominant school in treating scarlet fever, for instance, tries this, that, and the other remedy, which he thinks might possibly be of some use, until he hits upon one which seems to control the issues of the disease. Or he prescribes in the condition this, that, or the other remedy, which has obtained a reputation for usefulness in this disease. The first of these methods is, of course, experimental, and the second empirical in the extreme. Besides these, excluding the use of remedies which act simply in a chemical sense as neutralizing agents, a physician of the dominant school has but one other method of therapeutic procedure. This is to prescribe "allopathically," that is, to give a remedy which, by reason of its drug action, produces symptoms the opposite of those induced by the disease. To illustrate: If the patient have fever some drug is given to forcibly hold the heart, thus preventing its rapid action with the resulting increase of temperature; or, in flagging heart, that organ is whipped on and forced into more rapid action by the administration of a simu-

---

\*In this essay the "Old School," that is, the so-called "Regular" or "Allopathic," since it predominates in numbers, will be spoken of as the "Dominant School."

lant, like whisky or strychnine. Such practice is too often fatal in its results, and in any case, the reaction from or secondary effect of such treatment is bound to be pernicious.

With no fixed formula and no unity of thought regarding the use of medicine, every physician of the dominant school is authority unto himself in the selection of remedies. The result is, that for any given disease or set of symptoms there may be as many different prescriptions as there are doctors of the dominant school.

All this is different in Homœopathy. For a given set of symptoms, no matter where the homœopathic physician was educated, or where he may practice, be it in Maine or California, the Dominion of Canada or the British Isles, the remedy selected will be the same. As in the selection of glasses for a definite error of refraction scientific oculists from one end of the world to the other will reach the same conclusion as to the need of the patient, so in homœopathic practice, definite and positive symptoms of disease will call for the same remedy with every prescriber.

#### **The Reasonableness of the Theory of Similars.**

The reason for this marked difference between the schools, as has been said, is because the homœopathic physician believes that in disease and health there are certain laws, as there are in every other department of the physical world, while the physician of the dominant school denies this, or at least denies the value of the so-called "law of similars." It is not possible, perhaps, to explain the rationale of this law of cure, but the Homœopathist is not the only scientist forced to acknowledge ignorance of the underlying laws of his specialty. Where is the physicist who can explain the law of magneto-electric induction, or the law of gravitation? He can demonstrate the law by showing experiments to verify it, but to explain sensibly or convincingly why or how, he cannot. The theologian has the same difficulty with the doctrine of the immaculate conception, and the chemist can hardly account for some of the chemical affinities familiar as working

truths. Thus it may be excused the Homœopathist, perhaps, if he fail to scientifically account for the theory of similars. It is the conclusion of the homœopathic profession that this theory affords a working hypothesis satisfactorily accounting for certain medical phenomena, and in the terms of which, outside of purely chemical processes already referred to, *every certain procedure known to the medical profession can be explained*. Further, in order that the lay mind may not misunderstand its position, it is claimed by the homœopathic school that every single remedy, known to have curative properties in the relief of disease, acts in harmony with and is prescribed, even if unknowingly so, in accordance with the theory expressed in the phrase *Similia similibus curantur*.

The dominant school to-day, therapeutic skeptics\* as they admit themselves to be, certify to four sure remedies—mercury in syphilis, quinine in malaria, salicylate of soda in rheumatism, and iron in anæmia.

---

\*The skepticism, almost nihilism, as regards the value of remedies of the dominant school is shown by this quotation from one of its eminent exponents, Prof. H. C. Wood, in the preface of his "Treatise on Therapeutics:" "Experience is said to be the mother of wisdom. Verily she has been in medicine rather a blind leader of the blind, and the history of medical progress is the history of a man groping in the darkness, finding seeming gems of truth, one after another, only in a few minutes to cast each back into a heap of forgotten baubles that in their day had also been mistaken for verities. Narrowing our gaze to the regular profession to a few decades, what do we see? Experience teaching that not to bleed a man for pneumonia is to consign him to an unopened grave, and experience teaching that to bleed a man suffering with pneumonia is to consign him to a grave never opened by nature. Looking at the revolutions of the past, listening to the therapeutic babel of the present, is it a wonder that men should take refuge in nihilism, and like the lotus eaters, dream that all alike is folly, that rest and quiet and calm are the only human fruitions?"

The most radical of the dominant school, denying the homœopathicity of these remedies, would admit that the poisonous action of each is remarkably similar to the disease it has power to cure. If time and space permitted, in addition, this writer would attempt, at least, some citations of remarkable scientific facts which exist and which apparently vindicate the claims of similia, but enough has been shown to prove that the entire homœopathic practice and such of the practice of the dominant school as is conceded by that school to be of positive therapeutic value are in harmony with and are explained by the theory of similars. It is not begging the question, therefore, to leave the matter here and claim that until future generations find a better hypothesis we have the right to accept the theory of similars as the law of cure.

#### **Importance of Exact Prescribing.**

One who has observed the great variety of symptoms met in different types of typhoid fever, or any other disease, will at once appreciate the value of a system which seeks to select a remedy suited to the particular case in hand, and, to differentiate it from all other remedies useful in other types of the same disease. It is not enough to treat a disease *by name*, as is the practice of the dominant school, or to prescribe for a disease because of the peculiar manifestations which are common to all cases of the same disease. The remedy must be selected to fit the special symptoms presented by the individual patient. When so selected, the remedy fits the disease as the wing of the bird fits the air. Any other method of prescribing is as likely to result in misfits as would happen in a ready-made shoe store if the ridiculous rule prevailed that to every soldier customer a No. 8 shoe should be sold, to every blacksmith a No. 9, and to every farmer a No. 10. Homœopathy is exact in its methods and employs no ready made garments to fit its patrons, regardless of form, height and station. Every garment is made to order and is fitted only after careful consideration of many patterns.

#### **Superior Results of Homœopathic Practice.**

The layman investigating Homœopathy for the

first time has a right to ask whether or not it is a success in practice. Homœopathy must prove beyond cavil that its system is, at least, the equal of any other, in percentage of cures, short duration of disease, and low death rate. It is not incumbent upon it to show more, but it is greatly to its advantage to prove, not alone its equality to other systems, but also, if possible, its superiority. If its results are equal to those shown by another system it may be accused of adopting the methods of that school; if they are superior, however, either the practice is acutally different, or else the Homœopathist has a way of more successfully employing the methods of the other school. In either event the public will be satisfied to give preference to the homœopathic physician.

Statistics are not always reliable, but for the purpose of the present discussion there seems no other way of presenting the truthfulness of this claim. The cities of Baltimore, Cincinnati, Brooklyn, Detroit, St. Paul, Providence, Denver, Indianapolis, Syracuse, Rochester, Nashville, and Seattle are selected as fairly representing every variety of climate and every phase of therapeutic practice. Because the figures are at hand, the year 1894 is chosen, and it is no more favorable to the argument than any other year would prove to be.

During that year the practitioners of the dominant school in these cities had a death rate in measles of 3 per cent.; the homœopathic profession lost 0.8 per cent. The mortality rate in scarlet fever was 9.24 per cent. for the dominant school; 5.66 per cent. for the homœopathic. The typhoid fever mortality was high for both schools; for the dominant school 22.56 per cent., for the homœopathic 15.15 per cent. These figures are duplicated wherever the two schools are brought in competition, as, for instance, in Cook County Hospital, Chicago, at the University of Michigan, the University of Iowa, and the University of Minnesota.

Not only is the death rate very much reduced by homœopathic prescribing, but also the average duration of the disease is shortened. This fact was shown by some figures prepared by the British



Government, whereby it was demonstrated that a homœopathic hospital at Melbourne, Australia, treated as many cases of typhoid fever as a hospital of the dominant school having twice as many beds.

It is useless to multiply figures, they all lead to the same conclusion. The eminent Dr. Osler, recently called to Oxford College from Johns Hopkins University, admitted that the homœopathic school is at least the equal of his own when he said: "Nobody has ever claimed that the mortality among homœopathic practitioners was greater than those of the regular school." But the homœopathic profession claims, and without fear of successful contradiction, that the mortality rate among its practitioners is far less than the mortality in the dominant school, and the duration of the disease shorter.

#### **The Medicine Prepared by the Physician.**

It is customary for the homœopathic physician to dispense his own medicines. This fact is sometimes put forward as an argument in the line of economy, for the employment of this school. There is an advantage in the practice greater than the saving in drug bills; the physician himself becomes responsible for the purity and the accurate preparation of the remedy. Undoubtedly many a practitioner of the dominant school, depending upon the pharmacist for the proper filling of the prescription and trusting that it will fall into competent hands, suffers defeat in the struggle with disease because of "substitution," careless or incompetent preparation, or delay in filling his prescription. The Medical Record states that a great number of Chicago apothecaries will be prosecuted for selling adulterated drugs. This prominent journal of the dominant school, in the issue of December 17, 1904, says: "Chemical tests have been made and evidence produced which prove the presence of alien matter in many prescriptions calling for pure drugs. In nearly 20 per cent. of the samples obtained there was not even a trace of the drug called for in the prescription. The tests, conducted by Dr. John A. Wesener, showed the following: Twenty-three prescriptions, no trace of the drug called for; 66 prescriptions, 80 per cent. impurities; 10 prescriptions,



20 per cent. impurities; 9 prescriptions, 10 per cent impurities; 31 prescriptions, pure." A similar scandal, involving New York City druggists, recently stirred the medical profession and the laity of that metropolis.

Besides avoiding the possibility of substitution, there certainly is an advantage to the patient in having the remedy prepared on the spot and the directions regarding its use made clear by explanations of the physician himself. Many mistakes and many failures in medical practice have resulted from the indirect methods of the pharmacist and the brief, unsatisfactory directions written on the label of the medicine.

#### **Drug Habits Not Induced By Homœopathic Prescribing**

While the homœopathic physician may admit the occasional necessity for prescribing medicines liable to induce drug habits if continuously used, yet, as a matter of fact, this procedure is rare in his practice. On the other hand, there is no denying that the more careless of the practitioners of the dominant school have been responsible for the development of such habits, and have made inebriates of all too many of their patients.\* While this criticism may perhaps apply to some individual members of the homœopathic profession, it cannot be passed upon the system itself, as, it is sad to say, may be done with the dominant school. This writer has no desire to say harsh, unkind, and, above all else, untrue things of the other school, but it must be apparent that with the greater wealth of remedies and the greater confidence in therapeutic effects, the homœopathic prescriber has far less temptation to resort to purely palliative methods of treatment; for these reasons he rarely employs the hypodermic syringe and as rarely administers anodynes of any sort. Of necessity, therefore, the victims of induced habits are seldom found in homœopathic families.

#### **Homœopathic Physicians the Patrons of General Science.**

It is conscientiously believed that the superiority

---

\*It is well known that chronic constipation results from the abuse of laxatives and cathartics too commonly prescribed by physicians of the dominant school.

of the homœopathic practice has been proven in every disease, in every climate, and in every season. Yet it must not be imagined that the homœopathic physician looks askance upon the advances of general medicine. The sputum examination, for instance, in the diagnosis of throat and lung diseases, is given the same importance in the homœopathic world that it receives elsewhere. The most radical opponent of Homœopathy would not say that in the choice of a drug the presence or absence of the germ would influence his selection of a curative remedy. It would simply decide the question of climate or the general disposition of the patient. It means, at least, that much to the homœopathic prescriber. The laboratory methods of science receive the same patronage and the same encouragement in the homœopathic school as elsewhere. In surgery, in gynæcology, in ophthalmology, the same careful technique, the same skill, the same methods are every where employed. No one dare claim that the results of surgery in other schools are superior to those gained by the homœopathic operator.

The American Institute of Homœopathy has officially decreed that "A homœopathic physician is one who adds to his knowledge of medicine a special knowledge of homœopathic therapeutics. All that pertains to the great field of medicine is his by tradition, by inheritance, by right." The patient, therefore, who employs the homœopathic physician gives himself all that the dominant school offers, and, in addition, the wonderful resources of the homœopathic *Materia Medica*. He loses nothing except the greater probability of escaping surgical procedure by the saving grace of a more potent medical armament. He reduces his chance of mortality and decreases the duration of his illness. All that pertains to chemical methods, to bacteriological research, to surgical ideas, to the great field of general medicine—all these belong to the homœopathic physician to give to his patient, together with the possibilities of the homœopathic remedy. In the language of the Chicago Inter-Ocean editorial, truly "They who have not tried Homœopathy have not half tried to get well."

## HOMŒOPATHY. A DIALOGUE.\*

BY W. H. DIEFFENBACH, M. D., NEW YORK.

*Time: The present.*

*Place: A large city.*

*Scene: Second-hand book store.*

*Persons: Young Medico and Second-hand Book Dealer.*

*Enter Young Medico in search of a few extra volumes of homœopathic Materia Medica for the purpose of filling the vacancy in his newly purchased book cases.*

*Young Medico:* Have you any homœopathic medical books for sale?

*Book Dealer:* Yes, I have a few. I have an old copy of Dunham's Science of Therapeutics, a broken set of Allen's Encyclopædia, also a copy of Hering's Domestic Physician; but I do not care to sell the latter, as I use it myself.

*Young Medico:* The Dunham is the only volume you have for sale, then? What is the price?

*B. D.:* Three dollars.

*Y. M.:* Three dollars? Why a new copy could be purchased for that price.

*B. D.:* Yes, I know; but this book is out of print, and homœopathic books, especially the old standard ones, are worth full value at all times. They sell like hot cakes. I always have a market for them. I have a choice collection of other medical works which I will sell you at cut figures. When these books are a few years old they seem to lose their value and become a dead weight on the shelves, and I will gladly sacrifice them, if you will look them over.

---

\*This dialogue actually occurred almost as reported. For purposes of this prize competition it has, however, been revised and added to in order to bring out arguments considered of value to the cause.

*Y. M.:* Well, I want the Dunham volume, and presume I will have to pay your price.

*B. D.:* Take it or leave it. I can readily dispose of it. By the way, Doctor, may I ask you a few questions regarding Homœopathy? I am much interested in the subject, especially since studying a few of the books I have had from time to time, and since trying some of the remedies in my own family?

*Y. M.:* Shoot ahead! I will try to answer your questions as well as I can.

*B. D.:* Well, I must tell you that I first became interested in Homœopathy from the fact that your old wornout homœopathic books were such good sellers, while the other medical works when ten or twenty years old barely bring the price of waste paper. Doctors frequently come in here and look for homœopathic books, and the older the book the better they appear to like it. My policy in purchasing is, therefore, based on different lines regarding values; homœopathic books I always pay liberally for, while other medical works, unless they are very recent editions, I fight shy of. I have had considerable sickness in my family, so I naturally became interested in medicine, and during dull times read some of your musty volumes. The more I read the more I felt that your system was founded on fixed lines, the law of similars, and that this explained why your books did not lose in value with every new medical discovery. I mentioned this conclusion to one of my patrons of the other school, and what do you suppose he said?

*Y. M.:* Well?

*B. D.:* He said that Homœopathy had made no progress in one hundred years, and that accounted for the fact that the old books were still popular. The Homœopaths have stood still, the others have progressed, hence the frequent changes in their books and treatment.

*Y. M.:* My dear man, the next time you see your friend kindly tell him for me that he is in error, and that if he had taken the pains to investigate the homœopathic colleges and hospitals he would find them equal in every way to the best in the country. In

collateral sciences the homœopathic student is drilled as well as any other medical student. He is also familiarized with old school *materia medica* and its uses; but the main study and distinction and the abyss which separates him from his allopathic brother is the acceptance by the homœopathic student and physician of several distinct and clear cut enunciations in regard to his therapeutics.

These principles were proclaimed by Samuel Hahnemann, the founder of the homœopathic school, about one hundred years ago, and they are as true to-day as they were at that time.

*B. D.:* You refer to the therapeutic law "*Similia similibus curantur*?"

*Y. M.:* Yes, and several other principles. There are minor differences among the homœopathic physicians, and there are two national associations which exist separately owing to differences of opinion as to the potency (strength) of drug to be employed in cases of disease. The following principles, however, *all men claiming to affiliate with the homœopathic school can readily subscribe to:*

I. The principle of similars; let likes be cured by likes.

II. To ascertain the value of drugs and apply above principle, have all drugs tested (proven) on the healthy human organism (not only on dogs, rabbits, guinea pigs, and the other lower animals).

III. Employ the smallest possible dose to restore the sick to health based on the first principle.

*B. D.:* How is a person to determine what is the smallest dose to give in a stated case? I have purchased a small stock of your prominent remedies and have used them in my family in cases of emergency, but am always in doubt how much to give and how strong to give it. Can you put me on the right track on "the potency question," as your journals call it?

*Y. M.:* I would advise you not to treat your own family or any one else. Call in a homœopathic physician; the telephone is always handy and you can quickly get a response. As you seem so much interested, however, I will say that the potency question you speak of has been a thorn in the flesh

for many years, and may never be settled to the satisfaction of every one. Hahnemann in his own practice employed the first, second, sixth, sixteenth and preferably (towards the end of his life) the thirtieth potency. But because a physician gives a few drops of the tincture of medicine in a glass of water he does not forfeit his right to membership among Homœopaths. The potency question is a matter for personal discrimination and experience, and the fact that the founder of Homœopathy and his most eminent disciples constantly varied these so-called potencies, shows that no distinct line can be drawn in this controversy. Hahnemann, as you already know, discovered that disease could be cured by a remedy which, when given to the healthy, produces similar subjective and objective symptoms to those observed in the disease. The closer the symptoms were allied the greater the certainty of a cure. This, of course, excludes cases of poisoning when antidotal measures and removal of the disturbing element are resorted to by doctors of all schools.

I will give you an illustration of the application of homœopathic medication in the case of a prominent clergyman which recently came to my care. The patient had fever of over 103 degrees, had mental anguish and anxiety, fear of impending danger, a dry, red throat, hoarse voice, dry, tingling, hot skin, hard, full, quick pulse, and a history of exposure to cold. A short, dry, hard cough accompanied these symptoms. Physical examination showed dullness in the right lower lobe of the lung, respiratory lagging on the affected side, and moist rales throughout the right upper lobes. The left lung had compensatory increase in respiratory effort, and the whole clinical picture presented a congestion of the right lung with possibly impending pneumonia. Did we select a remedy "good for congestion of the lung or pneumonia," or did we select a remedy which Prof. Boon's or some pharmaceutical firm "recommends" in this condition? No; we selected the remedy which, when given in proper doses to a healthy individual, produces the complex of symptoms detailed above. These symptoms are





found under Aconite. Aconite was given in the third potency, frequently repeated, and within forty-eight hours the fever had abated and medication was suspended. Proper diet and rest in bed was, of course, enjoined, and the few remaining symptoms of illness combatted by remedies corresponding to the symptoms exhibited by the patient at the time of administration. Will we, on the basis of this success, prescribe Aconite for the next case of congestion or hyperæmia of the lungs? Not unless the symptoms correspond. The case may demand some entirely different remedy if the symptoms presented call for it. It is this fact that each case must be examined on its merits and prescribed for on its peculiar and distinct manifestations that makes good homœopathic prescribing so difficult and compels constant study of the Materia Medica. Our system of prescribing is much more difficult than that of the allopathic or eclectic school on this account. We do not prescribe for the name of the disease, but for the sick individual and prescribe according to a fixed law which has been found true for over one hundred years. Do you wonder that homœopathic physicians consider their methods superior to that of the other medical brethren? Visit ten allopathic physicians and give them a recital of your disease and request a prescription for the same. Try the same experiment with ten homœopathic physicians. I will venture my fortune that the prescriptions of the allopathic physicians will show a great diversity of formulæ, containing a multiplicity of drugs, while a majority of the homœopathic physicians will prescribe *the same drug in each instance*. This test was actually performed by a California physician some years ago, and turned out just as predicted above. The Homœopaths surely deserve the title of "therapeutic regulars," our allopathic friends being regularly "irregular" in their therapeutic methods. This statement is open to verification by anyone desiring to make the test.

At the beginning of his career as a Homœopath Hahnemann gave crude drugs, and he gradually reduced the material drug by so-called potentization (taking for the first potency one part of drug sub-

stance and ninety-nine of water, alcohol, or sugar of milk and triturating or shaking same vigorously so as to obtain a finely divided intimate mixture, and repeating this proportion for each higher potency).

When practicing in Paris, Hahnemann found that drugs thus potentized, eighteen, twenty-four, or even thirty times, still possessed medical value, and his results even appeared more pronounced than heretofore, so that he attributed it to "a spirit-like force," which was liberated by the frequent succussion or trituration. To-day we find in the same city of Paris a Professor Robin "discovering" that gold and silver if finely divided by electric disassociation, ionization, are efficient remedies in pneumonia, and the old school medical journals quickly herald the new discovery as a boon for our pneumonia suffering humanity. If these learned individuals would look up the provings of gold and silver in our books on *Materia Medica* they would note that one, Samuel Hahnemann, M. D., advised the application of these remedies about one hundred years ago in this and other diseases when the symptoms of the patient correspond to those of the provings of these drugs on the healthy.

*B. D.:* Doctor, your talk is most interesting, and I am astonished that your school does not increase numerically and over-shadow the rest of the profession.

*Y. M.:* It is strange, but it is all a matter of education. Every little while such "discoveries" as are heralded by Dr. Robin serve to call attention anew to the eternal and unchanging verity of the homœopathic law. Such subtle agencies as the X-ray and radium confirm it. The X-ray, for instance, if used to excess, as noted in the case of Edison's laboratory assistant, of Dr. Weigel, of Rochester, N. Y., and others, has produced cancerous conditions of the skin, and nothing has been more wonderful than the many cures of superficial cancers due to the judicious use of the X-ray. Some wag of an allopathic medical editor exclaims that this coincidence may open up a new field for thought. It does, brother! It does.

A few months ago the daily press contained arti-

cles on the discovery of the value of bee stings in rheumatism. The medical press commented on the subject favorably, and a prominent pharmaceutical house promptly announced its willingness to supply the medical profession with bee poison, the newly vaunted specific for rheumatism. This remedy has been used by homœopathic physicians for over fifty years under the name of *Apis mellifica* or *Apium virus*, and is prescribed in rheumatic conditions when the symptoms peculiar to the drug are exhibited by the case in question. These symptoms are œdematous swelling, with stinging, throbbing and burning; sensitiveness to touch, bruised, tired feeling; amelioration from cold, aggravation from warmth. Not every case of rheumatism presents these symptoms, and *Apis* is only beneficial where its symptomatology is present and in none other.

Our allopathic friends have recently adopted *Hepar sulphur*, an old homœopathic polycrest, under the name of Calcium sulphide, as an efficient agent in combatting purulent conditions. They also find nitroglycerine, proven by Homœopaths, to be valuable in many conditions. Their text-books are littered with recommendations of "small doses" of so and so are "good for" such and such a condition. If our shy friends would only go one step further and say "these small doses" are good for such and such distinct symptoms, because these stated drugs produce similar symptoms in the healthy, the battle for conversion would be complete.

If a chair of Homœopathy could be established in but one prominent old school college and the principles of Homœopathy enunciated in a clear and simple manner, and this be followed by practical demonstrations in hospitals affiliated with the colleges, the way would soon be open for other colleges to follow suit, and the separate sectarian existence of Homœopaths be eliminated. It does not seem unreasonable to expect that this time must come when by true aggressiveness the Homœopath draws attention to his method of drug therapeutics and the public becomes possessed of the true knowledge of the present status of Homœopathy and homœopathic physicians.

Well do I remember when I appeared before the examiners of the State board for the final examination which would permit me to practice in this State. There were some three hundred other applicants of all schools. We all received the same question papers in anatomy, physiology, chemistry, pathology, hygiene, bacteriology, obstetrics and surgery, and probably all answered the questions approximately alike. The only difference in the examination between the old school, the so-called "regular" candidates and myself was in the paper on therapeutics and practice. I subsequently saw the old school therapeutics and practice questions, and am certain that I could have answered them satisfactorily. Could the old school candidates have answered the homœopathic questions? I believe not. There you have the relative educational difference between the homœopathic physician of to-day and the old school physician of to-day. We are taught all recognized measures required for a medical education, and besides acquire an additional knowledge of homœopathic drug therapeutics, while the old school physician, in spite of much dissatisfaction with his vacillating materia medica, is too prejudiced to investigate the methods of his homœopathic colleagues. The truth is mighty, however, and must in the end prevail.

*B. D.:* Why don't you use the public press for the purpose of popularizing Homœopathy?

*Y. M.:* That would be a difficult matter. A more efficient means would be to supply each homœopathic physician with documents or pamphlets, written in plain terms, on the question, and through friends and patients disseminate the truths.

This might be supplemented, as it is now done in Germany, with popular lectures on Homœopathy delivered by competent exponents of the cause to which laymen are admitted, and questions are freely asked and answered.

*B. D.:* Doctor, when you succeed in doing that do not forget me as one interested in the matter. I will do all I can to help along the good cause.

## **HOMŒOPATHY; WHAT IT IS AND WHY IT IS SUPERIOR IN THE TREATMENT OF DISEASE.**

BY JAMES WALSH, M. D., CORTLAND, N. Y.

In bringing to the attention of that part of the people who have never been blessed with a knowledge of the homœopathic method in the treatment of a disease, many of whom perhaps have been prevented from acquiring a knowledge of the system through a prejudice imbibed from hostile surroundings and teachings, the writer will endeavor to show in an orderly, clear and simple manner the superiority of the system over that of the traditional medical system. He will also show just what Homœopathy is, divested of all the ridiculous and silly things with which ignorance and malice have clothed it, and why it should appeal to intelligent and progressive people.

Ignorance with a desire for knowledge is easily dissipated. Prejudice, on the other hand, is difficult to combat because in the first place it is a hard matter to obtain a hearing, and secondly, prejudice is imbibed, and is never the result of a process of reasoning, rather it attempts to bring reason and logic to the support of a preconceived impression or idea, never to dissipate it. The greatest asset of the prejudiced mind is sophistry; with this it distorts facts, assumes false premises and draws illogical conclusions. In order, therefore, to eradicate prejudice a sincere desire for truth must be cultivated regardless of consequences. Truth is the goal towards which man is always pushing because it is final and immutable.

The dearest possession to the rational man is the thing we call life. All systems of jurisprudence recognize this. It is evidenced in the many and varied endeavors to perpetuate it, from Ponce de Leon, in his quest for the fountain of youth, to the ultra-materialistic scientist, who believes that life is simply a thing of matter and force which may be duplicated in his laboratory. All sincere effort,

therefore, directed towards the prolongation and saving of life and relief from the things which militate against it is a boon to mankind and should be recognized and appreciated.

Homœopathy is a system of medical practice perfectly rational and scientific. In order to demonstrate this it will be well to group our facts under certain heads which will encompass the whole subject.

I. Homœopathy, definition and history.

II. How it differs from other systems and why it is preferable.

III. Statistical information.

#### **I. Homœopathy, Definition and History.**

What is Homœopathy? Homœopathy is a method of selection and administration of drugs for the cure of disease and the alleviation of its sufferings, which method is based upon a rule or law which is invariable and unchangeable. This is Homœopathy, nothing more or nothing less, and comprises all that is claimed for it. "A homœopathic physician," according to the definition adopted by the American Institute of Homœopathy, the national body, "is one who adds to his knowledge of medicine a special knowledge of homœopathic therapeutics and observes the law of similia. All that pertains to the great field of medical learning is his by tradition, by inheritance, by right." In other words, the physician who practices Homœopathy is a physician in its broadest sense. He is at liberty to use and does use in the interests of his patients all medical knowledge, to employ any known measure in the curative realm as his judgment may dictate. Homœopathy pertains only to the use of drugs as a therapeutic measure. Other methods utilized in combating disease, such as surgery, hygiene, diet, heat and cold, electricity and mechanical measures, are the instruments of medical men in general regardless of school.

Homœopathy was founded and developed by Samuel Hahnemann, a German physician. Hahnemann was born April 11, 1755, at Meissen, Saxony, and died in the year 1843, at Paris. He began his medical studies at Leipzig, at the age of 20, where he supported himself by translating French and



German works into English. From Leipzig he went to Vienna to pursue his studies, and was graduated at the University of Erlangen in 1779. After eight years of conscientious work in the practice of his profession, he became dissatisfied with the existing methods of treatment, which were the result of the lack of a true knowledge of the causes, nature and course of disease and of the action of drugs. He wrote: "I had conscientious scruples about treating unknown morbid states in my suffering fellow creatures with these unknown medicines, which, being powerful substances, may, if they be not exactly suitable, change life into death, or produce new affections or chronic ailments which are often much more difficult to remove than the original disease." Again, speaking of drugs, he says: "And how is the physician to know whether they are suitable or not, seeing that their peculiar modes of action are not yet elucidated?" And again: "To become in this way the murderer or the aggravator of the sufferings of my brethren, of mankind, was to me a fearful thought. So fearful and distressing was it, that shortly after my marriage I abandoned the practice and scarcely treated any one for fear of doing him harm, and occupied myself chiefly with chemistry and literary labors."

In order to understand the mental attitude of Hahnemann let us glance at the condition of medical practice at the time of which he writes. The chief instrument at that time for the treatment of disease was drugs. Little or nothing was known by the medical profession of that period, of surgery, hygiene, diet, electricity, baths, etc., which to-day occupy such a prominent and indispensable position in our methods of combating disease, both as to prevention and cure. Their knowledge of drug action was very crude. It was on a par with their knowledge of the origin and nature of disease. Disease was looked upon as the result of the presence in the blood of certain so-called humors or morbid products, the elimination of which by means of large doses of powerful drugs, the nature of whose action upon the organism was not understood, was necessary to restore health. Thus it was thought that the *removal of large quantities of blood from the body*

accomplished this; therefore, all patients were bled without regard to the nature of the disease which affected them. Large doses of powerful cathartics and emetics were prescribed for the same purpose of eliminating these so-called noxious humors or disease entities. Disease was considered to be a material entity, which had to be destroyed by powerful measures and drugs regardless of the effect on the body of the measures and drugs themselves. Hahnemann, a highly educated physician, an able scholar, a close observer, an original thinker, and a deeply conscientious and religious man, saw the dire results to humanity of this mode of treatment which was founded upon theories gratuitously emanating from the minds of different individuals and absolutely incapable of demonstration. He, realizing the incalculable harm resulting from this treatment, relinquished the practice of medicine. He did not, however, give up his study. He believed that a rational and scientific mode of drug action existed. While engaged in the translation of Cullen's work on *Materia Medica*, he was dissatisfied with the author's explanation of the action of Cinchona bark (from which Quinine is obtained) in malarial conditions. He resolved to test the action of the drug upon himself while in perfect health. To his surprise he found that the drug produced the symptoms of malarial fever, including chills, fever and sweat, which corresponded to the exact symptoms for which it was prescribed in disease. The result of this experiment, like the falling of the apple to Newton, started his thought in the direction of obtaining a knowledge of the exact action of drugs upon the human economy, and he carried it to a successful conclusion. He experimented in the same manner with a large number of drugs and found that each produced certain morbid symptoms peculiar to itself. He examined carefully the records of the action of poisonous drugs upon the human organism when taken in poisonous doses, and thus collected into one complete whole the grosser and finer shades of drug action. Following out the experiment he also found that the drug, when given in sufficiently small doses to prevent producing an aggravation, cured diseases which exhibited the same symptoms

as those produced upon a healthy individual by the drug. All of this was demonstrated only after long, laborious and painstaking experiments. As the result of these experiments Hahnemann formulated the following propositions:

1. That the rational mode of ascertaining drug action upon the human economy is by testing them upon a healthy person.
2. That the curative properties of a drug corresponds to its disease-producing properties upon the healthy human organism.
3. That as a necessary consequence of the first two propositions the drug must be administered in such a dose that will not excite too great an aggravation of the existing or natural disease.

From the first two propositions he formulated the law of "Similia Similibus Curentur," or "Let likes be treated by likes," which is the homœopathic rule of drug therapeutics.

Now as the knowledge of drug action is obtained by a proving of drugs singly upon healthy individuals a natural corollary of the law would be that only one drug should be used at a time in treating diseased conditions. Two or more drugs used together would scarcely be rational practice, since a knowledge of their combined action has never been obtained in provings.

To recapitulate: Homœopathy is a therapeutic law whose expression is found in "Similia similibus curentur." It is based upon the fundamental principles:

1. That drug action is known only by provings upon healthy human beings.
2. That the curative properties of a drug correspond to its disease-producing properties.
3. That only sufficient of the medicine should be given to effect a cure.
4. That only one medicine should be used at a time.

This is, in brief, the definition and history of Homœopathy. Many absurd and ridiculous statements relative to its practice have been said and written through ignorance and malice. The history of medical practice since its beginning has been one of intolerance of anything which was in opposition to

the existing ideas or system, and is not one that we can look back upon with complacency. Dr. Harvey, who demonstrated the circulation of the blood, probably the greatest epoch in medical history, was persecuted, reviled and almost driven from practice. The introduction of Peruvian bark, from which we obtain quinine, into medical practice, was brought about only through "great tribulation." Vaccination was ridiculed by the profession. I cite these instances to show why it was impossible that the teachings of Hahnemann could not but excite ridicule, scorn and persecution from his brothers in the profession. The opposition to the homœopathic method to-day by the allopathic physician is due to the prejudice imbibed from his professors and perpetuated through ignorance of the method or the lack of courage to acknowledge the truth of a principle they so long persecuted.

The age we live in is progressive. It applauds conscientious work along any line of human endeavor. The truth of the homœopathic method is surely becoming recognized by the medical profession in general. A strong factor in bringing this about has been the attitude of the people who long have recognized the value and efficacy in homœopathic treatment.

## **2. How It Differs From Other Systems and Why It Is Preferable.**

In writing under this caption the comparisons will be made necessarily with the dominant or the traditional system of medicine as related to drug therapeutics. This system we will denominate the allopathic system, since it is so known in the popular mind. Before, however, pointing out the manner in which the homœopathic administration of drugs and their effect upon disease, differs from the allopathic, it will be well to show how the homœopathic and allopathic physician resemble each other and thus dispose of certain false ideas with which a certain part of the public have been imbued. The status of the homœopathic physician has been misrepresented in many ways, and many foolish and silly things have been said by ignorant or malicious persons to prejudice the popular mind against him.

In the first place, all regularly graduated physicians of whatever school are equal before the law. In all the States laws exist which regulate the practice of medicine and surgery. The requirements under these laws are the same for the homœopathic and the allopathic physician. In a majority of the States the medical schools are under the direct control and supervision of the State, which fixes a standard of general and medical education with which all medical schools must comply. Under this arrangement the general educational requirements preliminary to the study of medicine, also the general medical education necessary to equip a student for the responsibilities of medical practice, are the same for the homœopathic and the allopathic schools. Therefore, a student in a homœopathic school must be as well grounded in anatomy, physiology, chemistry, surgery, diagnosis, etc., as is the allopathic student. They are required to pass the same examinations before their respective State boards before license to practice is granted. In other words, all medical students and physicians are equal before the law, and all must comply with certain regulations, educational and otherwise, regardless of the fact as to whether they are homœopathic or allopathic. Therefore, the homœopathic practitioner understands surgery, diagnosis, history and treatment of disease and other auxilliary sciences as well as the allopathic physician. His knowledge, therefore, encompasses all that of the allopath, and, *in addition*, the knowledge of the science of homœopathic therapeutics. He prescribes his drugs, where drugs are available, according to the homœopathic method, because he knows it is scientific, accurate and according to a definite law, also because his experience has taught him that it is productive of the *best results* for the sufferings of humanity. Remember, homœopathic as well as allopathic physicians are men of wide medical education, with trained minds and animated by the same lofty aim to relieve the sufferings of humanity.

Now as to the differences in the methods of the two schools. It lies chiefly in the manner of prescribing and administering drugs.

The first and most natural objection of one unacquainted with Homœopathy is the small dose. He



says, how can the small amount of medicine you prescribe have any possible effect in disease when a well person may take a whole bottle without any deleterious effects? This is a fair question, and the explanation is made clear and convincing only after a correct knowledge is obtained of the principle upon which the drug is given.

The allopathic physician gives his drugs for their physiological effect, which means that the drug must produce a marked impression, discernible to the senses, upon the organ or tissue upon which it is expected to act, and, as a rule, the effect of the drug must be the opposite of the condition existing in the body, or the disease. In order to obtain his effect the dose must be a large one; thus, if he prescribes for constipation he gives a drug that will produce a diarrhœa, and thus force an action of the bowel, ignoring or not discerning that the constipation is not the disease but simply the effect of the disease. Therefore, when the effect of the cathartic passes off the constipation remains because the drug produced an artificial disease only, and the cause producing the constipation was not affected. The homœopathic physician instead of prescribing a drug that produces a condition dissimilar to the natural disease gives one that produces a condition similar to the natural disease; thus, when he prescribes for constipation he selects a drug that will produce a constipation if given in the same dose as the allopathic physician gives, or the physiological dose. The dose prescribed according to the homœopathic method must necessarily, therefore, be small to prevent an aggravation of the natural disease from the drug effects.

Now the next logical question would be, "Why does medicine administered according to the homœopathic method cure better than that administered according to the allopathic method?" It should first be borne in mind that all or nearly all drugs are poisons to the human economy whether in health or disease, and are powerful alike for evil and for good. When, therefore, a drug is introduced in the system in a large dose it acts as a decided irritant which is manifested by the symptoms it produces. These symptoms are known as the primary action of the drug. The secondary action consists in the effort of



the organism to compensate for the violence done to it by the primary action. Thus the effect of Epsom salts when taken into the system is to set up an active diarrhœa, which is brought about by the irritation it produces upon the nerve centers which control the secretions of the intestinal glands and the muscular fibres of the walls of the intestines. This represents the primary action of the salts and is the effect of the organism to rid itself of the drug. After the effects of the drug has passed off, or the diarrhœa has ceased, we get an aggravation of the constipation; this is due to the effort of nature to compensate for the violence done to the organism by the primary action of the drug, and constitutes the reaction of the organism. It is this action which explains why the opium habitue must constantly increase the dose to obtain the effects he desires, also why the individual suffering with constipation must gradually increase the amount of the drug to obtain cathartic effects.

When the drug is administered according to the homœopathic method, the irritation is set up along lines similar to the natural disease, and the dose being only sufficient to make an impression, the reaction of the organism effectually rids itself of the drug disease and with it the natural disease. If a large dose were given according to the homœopathic method it would greatly aggravate the natural disease and thus exhaust the powers of the organism with consequent failure of reaction. With the allopathic method the reaction of the organism, or the curative action, is not in consonance with the natural disease. With the homœopathic it is.

Allopathic doses over-stimulate and exhaust the reactive powers of the organism which is already weakened by disease. Homœopathic doses, being just sufficient to get an impression, stimulate without exhausting. So much for the small dose.

Allopathic doses frequently produce derangement of the digestive organs, thus adding a new disease to the already diseased body and interfering with proper nutrition. The effects of drugs upon the system is as much a disease as is a natural disease. These effects of the drug disease are measured only by the nature of the drug, the size of the dose and *the frequency of its repetition*. The system acts

promptly in ridding itself of drug disease, but its reactive power is exhausted by a powerful drug, in large doses and frequently repeated. The homœopathic dose being small produces no digestive or other disturbances, and its effect is easily dissipated by the organism.

The allopathic method of treating disease consists in treating individual symptoms as they arise in the course of a disease. Thus, in the course of a typhoid fever it often becomes necessary for the allopathic physician to administer a drug to combat the delirium, another drug to strengthen the heart's action, still another to act upon the gas which has accumulated in the intestine. These three conditions are usually present at the same time, and the patient is getting three or four different drugs simultaneously. This method is unscientific because the physician is ignorant as to the manner in which the different drugs react upon each other when taken into the body, and is, therefore, unable to distinguish what symptoms are the effects of the natural disease and what the result of the drugs. The homœopathic physician in making his prescriptions must take into consideration the whole aspect of the case, including the individual peculiarities of the patient and the disease, and select one drug whose action upon the healthy organism closely approximates the disease picture. *This is scientific because his knowledge of drug action is absolute, inasmuch as it is determined by experiment upon the healthy body.*

According to the allopathic method, before intelligent treatment can be instituted, a diagnosis of the disease is absolutely necessary. The allopathic boast is that it treats conditions not symptoms: but when, after the condition is ascertained, it immediately reverses itself and treats individual symptoms of the condition, as illustrated in the case of typhoid. Now it not infrequently happens that the diagnosis of an illness is obscure to the most skillful physician, and a number of hours or days may elapse before it is made certain, and occasionally it happens that the diagnosis is never made. Thus, when the diagnosis is the *sine qua non* of intelligent treatment much valuable time is often lost in waiting for the diagnosis to develop. The physician is thus groping in the

dark, and it may mean the life or death of the patient. The homœopathic method treats intelligently from the beginning regardless of the diagnosis because it selects a drug which covers the symptoms that the patient exhibits, these symptoms being the voice of the disease crying for help. Now I would have you understand that the diagnosis of the disease is necessary for continued intelligent treatment, also for prognostic purposes, whether the treatment be homœopathic or allopathic, but the homœopathic physician, following, as he does, a definite law in the selection of his remedies, is able to institute proper and intelligent treatment from the start and save valuable time.

Acute diseases, such as pneumonia, typhoid fever, scarlet fever, etc., are what are called self-limiting diseases, which means that the disease will either get well or go on to an unfavorable termination regardless of whether any medicine is given or not. Now the best allopathic authorities are a unit in their testimony that medicines, given according to their method have absolutely no influence upon these diseases; their treatment consists in attempts to sustain the strength and natural powers of the patient until the disease process has worn itself out. Homœopathic authorities, on the other hand, positively assert, and have abundant clinical proof in support of the assertion, that medicines administered according to the homœopathic method unquestionably influence the disease process itself and thus modify the severity and duration of the disease, and not infrequently aborts the whole process in its inception.

The allopathic method of drug administration, based as it is upon theories of diseased conditions and drug action, is unreliable, since these theories are often drawn from false premises, consequently the system has no stability. A drug is lauded today as a specific for a certain disease, but tomorrow it is discarded as worthless when the theory upon which its administration was based has been proven false, or when it has been demonstrated that the drug has done more harm to another organ than the good it has accomplished. The homœopathic method, based as it is upon a definite law, is unchangeable, and its efficacy is strengthened by facts *developed by modern scientific research.*

The foregoing are some of the most important differences between the homœopathic and the allopathic method of drug administration, and clearly demonstrates the superiority of the homœopathic method.

One is in consonance with the natural activities, the other opposes and exhausts.

One attacks the diseased part directly, and that part only, the other attacks organs not diseased and sets up a new disease in them, thus weakening an already weakened body.

One treats the patient, the other the disease or its effects.

One has an intelligent grasp on the treatment from the beginning, the other depends wholly upon the diagnosis for its treatment, and the diagnosis may be wrong, thus doing more harm than good.

One positively asserts that it can control, modify and abort disease processes, the other admits that it cannot.

The best and most progressive men in the allopathic profession to-day are discarding the use of drugs, with a few exceptions, claiming that administered as they are, according to the allopathic method, it is questionable whether they do not tend to do harm rather than good. They have lost faith in drugs and rely principally upon hygienic and dietetic measures for effects. In this mental state of disbelief in medicine they are constantly augmenting the sphere of surgery and narrowing the sphere of pure medicine. These are facts which may be confirmed by consulting allopathic books and journals.

The homœopathic physician has an abiding faith in his medicines. Brilliant results are his daily experience and strengthen this faith in his tried instruments. While he recognizes that surgery is necessary in some cases, he limits its field as much as possible, and does not use it because he knows no other way.

### **3. Statistical Information.**

In the United States to-day there are over sixteen thousand homœopathic physicians. In this body, besides the general practitioner, are represented every specialty in medicine. Homœopathic physicians fill places of trust and responsibility in every State in

the Union. They are all progressive and aggressive citizens in the localities in which they are established. The clientele of the homœopathic physicians are numbered in the millions and are found among the enlightened and progressive classes of our people.

In this country there are eighteen homœopathic medical colleges, thirty-two medical journals, eighty-five general homœopathic hospitals, sixty sanitariums, fifty-six dispensaries and sixty-six other institutions, State and municipal, where homœopathic treatment is used—all in a flourishing condition. Homœopathic hospitals and institutions are maintained in all countries of Europe and in many countries in Asia, particularly in India. All of this has been brought about within the past one hundred years in the face of the most bitter opposition of the traditional school of medicine, whereas the history of allopathic medicine covers over two thousand years.

Some cynic has said there are three kinds of lies, viz., white lies, plain lies, and statistics. No doubt the fellow was partially correct, but he was also partially wrong, and upon this latter aspect of the statement it can be truthfully said that abundant statistics prove that wherever the homœopathic and allopathic systems have been tried side by side in institutions and hospitals, the mortality has always been largely in favor of the homœopathic system.

Homœopathy has left its impress upon medical thought, and has brought about important and decided reforms in medical practice. The barbarity of heroic and poisonous doses of powerful drugs, the wholesale bleeding of patients and the puking and purging which Hahnemann in his almost inspired foresight railed against, has passed away. Hahnemann was a hundred years ahead of his time. His marvelous insight into the causes and nature of disease has been practically confirmed by modern scientific medical research, and sharply displays his wonderful intellect.

Homœopathy fills no asylums with its drug victims. It stands confident and strong with a firm faith in its resources and its ability to cure the ills of the flesh in a manner easy, gentle and permanent. Whoever has not tried the homœopathic method to *restore his lost health* has only half tried.



LANE MEDICAL LIBRARY

To avoid fine, this book should be returned on  
or before the date last stamped below.

--	--	--



Photomount  
Pamphlet  
Binder  
Gaylord Bros.  
Makers  
Stockton, Calif.  
PAT. JAN. 21, 1908

X578 Copeland, R.S.  
C78 In defense of homoeo-  
1905 pathy.

NAME

DATE DUE



